THE FOLLOWING DOCUMENTS
ARE ATTACHED:
(Please do not remove)

ER 89-1785

ICS-4244-89

ER 89-1955

DDST 502 89

ER 2928 89

DDI 01522X 89

SUBJECT: Aero-Space Plane

NASP

National Aero-Space Plane

Central Intelligence Agency
Office of the Deputy Director for Intelligence

NOTE FOR: Director of Central Intelligence

Attached is our response to your request for comment on the Washington Times article comparing US and international hypersonic aircraft programs.

John L. Helgerson
Deputy Director for Intelligence

Attachment

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2013/11/12
: CIA-RDP91B01306R000300070008-4

Next 3 Page(s) In Document Denied

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)
Washington Times Article, "Hypersonic Plane Plan Survives", dated 7 July 1989

FROM: [redacted] OSWR/SSD
70522 Secure
5Q32 NHB

EXTENSION

NO. DDI - 01522X-89 STAT

DATE

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)	DATE RECEIVED	DATE FORWARDED	OFFICER'S INITIALS	COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)
1. Director of Scientific and Weapons Research		7/18/89		
2.				
3. DI Registry Room 7E47, Hdqs.	O/DDI REG LOGGED			
4.				
5. Deputy Director for Intelligence Room 7E44, Hdqs.				
6.				
7. Executive Registry Room 7E12, Hdqs.				
8.				
9. Executive Director Room 7D55, Hdqs.				
10.				
11. Deputy Director of Central Intelligence Room 7D60, Hdqs.	7/24	7/24		
12.				
13. Director of Central Intelligence Room 7D60, Hdqs.	24 July	81		
14.				
15.				

FORM 1-79 610 USE PREVIOUS EDITIONS

GPO : 1983 O - 411-632

25X1

Next 2 Page(s) In Document Denied

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2013/11/12 : CIA-RDP91B01306R000300070008-4

Aviation Week & Space Technology
5 June 1989

Bush Administration Speeds NASP Review, Spurred by Soviet, German Competition

CRAIG COVAULT/WASHINGTON

An increased interest by the Soviet Union and West Germany in hypersonic aero-space planes is becoming a critical issue in White House assessments of whether to continue the U. S. National Aero-Space Plane (NASP) project.

U. S. aeronautics experts said there is growing evidence that the Soviet Union is aggressively developing hypersonic aero-space plane technology important to future military, space and transport vehicles (see story p. 95). West Germany recently approved $200 million in funding for its Sanger spaceplane technology development program, intensifying European work in the field.

The USSR is testing aero-space plane designs along with the ramjet/scramjet engine technology required to produce a hypersonic cruise vehicle, according to Georgiy Svishchev, director of the Soviet Central Aero-Hydrodynamic Institute

VIEWS TO BE PRESENTED

The Central Intelligence Agency is unsure of the significance of these developments, however. A National Space Council working group will air agency positions on NASP funding early next week, followed by a full space council meeting that will draw up specific NASP policy recommendations for President Bush.

Vice President Dan Quayle, space council chairman, was briefed last week on the U. S. aero-space plane program. U. S. contractors already are beginning to shut down their NASP technology development efforts because of concern that the recommendations will prompt sharp reductions in Fiscal 1990 funding. Rocketdyne has halted work on its new hypersonic shock tunnel and the NASP materials consortium, involving all project contractors, has begun to reduce its activity.

The White House review is being conducted with some urgency. A major slowdown, affecting the entire NASP program, could ensue unless a decision on long-term support is made within the next two or three weeks.

The Defense Dept. earlier cut its $300-million Fiscal 1990 share of the program, forcing the space council to reassess overall U. S. hypersonic policy (AW&ST Apr. 24, p. 20).

Significant new hypersonic funding approved by West Germany and the large hypersonic facilities used by the Soviet Union are a concern to U. S. hypersonic managers.

A space council NASP document says that "little is known of the Soviet program, but they are known to have developed large-scale research facilities and to have an ongoing hypersonic vehicle development program, which includes an aero-space plane component."

In addition to basic hypersonic vehicle testing, the Soviets also are using a new magnetogasdynamic hypersonic wind tunnel "ranked as the most capable hypersonic aerodynamic facility in the world," U. S. aeronautics analysts said.

The Soviet supersonic and hypersonic test facilities that were used to develop the Buran space shuttle also are cited by analysts as directly involved in the Soviet aero-space plane technology effort.

The USSR has developed large hypersonic engine test facilities with more capability than those operated by Rocketdyne and Marquardt for U. S. ramjet/scramjet engine development, U. S. analysts told AVIATION WEEK & SPACE TECHNOLOGY. The U. S. facilities cannot handle many full-scale components, although the Soviet facilities can, analysts said.

The West German hypersonic program also is accelerating. Both the U. S. and West Germany plan to highlight their hypersonic capability at the Paris air show next week. The chief scientist for the U. S. program, Thomas Gregory, is touring European hypersonic facilities this week to assess the potential for both competition and cooperation in hypersonic technology development.

The German Federal Ministry of Research and Technology has appropriated about $116 million for Sanger spaceplane research. Contributions from industry and other German agencies probably will bring the total to about $200 million through 1993. MBB is leading the effort, with at least four other German companies also involved in Sanger definition studies.

NEAR-TERM THREAT IN DISPUTE

CIA officials disagree with the view that the Soviet Union and West Germany pose a near-term competitive threat to the U. S. in hypersonic technology development for 21st-century aircraft and spacecraft. There also is debate on Japan's hypersonic capabilities.

A CIA review of Soviet, Japanese and West German hypersonic developments presented to the space council working group is controversial among NASP program engineers. The initial CIA assessment is that the U. S. is 10-15 years ahead of Japan and West Germany and that it is difficult to judge the overall Soviet capability.

This assessment was met with skepticism by several working group members. The CIA was asked by the working group to provide more detailed information for the additional NASP policy reviews this week and next week.

Many NASP engineers familiar with the Soviet, West German and Japanese programs believe those countries are only 3-5 years behind the U. S.—not 10-15 years, as characterized by the CIA. Most managers agree, however, that the USSR is far behind the U. S. in computational fluid dynamics (CFD) capability. This is a critical technology for hypersonic airframe and engine development.

The space council's issues document notes that "Japan is already using NASP-derived materials [for] other industries." The council has asked NASA, the Commerce Dept. and the Defense Dept. to document "more examples of how NASP technologies support non-aerospace applications."

The space council's recommendation will center on whether to continue the NASP program with two X-30 hypersonic research aircraft or whether to reduce the program to a lower-cost technology effort. Schedule slips in X-30 development also are being assessed.

If the $427 million requested for Fiscal 1990 is cut back to about $200 million as part of a White House policy decision, immediate contractor reductions would result to reduce corporate losses on the project.

A major objective of the space council's review is to determine whether the NASP program is a truly "national initiative," requiring presidential support in succeeding administrations, or whether it is simply a federal, "departmental" issue. If the council rules that NASP is a departmental issue, it will make the program more accountable to the specific budget situation in NASA and the Defense Dept. in any given year.

Another objective is to quantify the benefit of building two X-30 research aircraft, as opposed to pursuing an aggressive technology program that stops short of vehicle flight test.

"If we can get 80% of the NASP program value out of a less expensive technology program, then is the extra 20% of data to be derived by building the expensive X-30 going to be worth it?" one senior U. S. official asked.

One option being assessed in the review is whether the X-30 vehicle development phase could be restructured as a cooperative government/industry partnership, similar to that already being used in the NASP materials consortium. □

EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT

ROUTING SLIP

TO:			ACTION	INFO	DATE	INITIAL
	1	DCI		X		
	2	DDCI		X		
	3	EXDIR				
	4	D/ICS				
	5	DDI	X			
	6	DDA				
	7	DDO				
	8	DDS&T				
	9	Chm/NIC				
	10	GC				
	11	IG				
	12	Compt				
	13	D/OCA				
	14	D/PAO				
	15	D/PERS				
	16	D/Ex Staff				
	17					
	18					
	19					
	20					
	21					
	22					
		SUSPENSE _____ Date				

Remarks

ER 89-2928

Executive Secretary

12 July 1989
Date

3637 (10-81)

ROUTING AND TRANSMITTAL SLIP

Date 12 July

TO: (Name, office symbol, room number, building, Agency/Post)	Initials	Date
1. DDI		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		

✓	Action		File		Note and Return
	Approval		For Clearance		Per Conversation
	As Requested		For Correction		Prepare Reply
	Circulate		For Your Information		See Me
✓	Comment		Investigate		Signature
	Coordination		Justify		

REMARKS

See DCI's request for a comment.

DO NOT use this form as a RECORD of approvals, concurrences, disposals, clearances, and similar actions

FROM: (Name, org. symbol, Agency/Post)	Room No.—Bldg.
EA / DCI	Phone No.

5041-102

OPTIONAL FORM 41 (Rev. 7-76)
Prescribed by GSA
FPMR (41 CFR) 101-11.206

★ U.S. GPO: 1988 — 241-174

EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT

ROUTING SLIP

TO:		ACTION	INFO	DATE	INITIAL
1	DCI		X		
2	DDCI		X	7/13	RK
3	EXDIR				
4	D/ICS				
5	DDI	X			
6	DDA				
7	DDO				
8	DDS&T				
9	Chm/NIC				
10	GC				
11	IG				
12	Compt				
13	D/OCA				
14	D/PAO				
15	D/PERS				
16	D/Ex Staff				
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
	SUSPENSE _____ Date				

Remarks

ER 89-2928

Executive Secretary

12 July 1989
Date

3637 (10-81)

2221 — please comment on this WAW

ER 89-2928

The Washington Post
The New York Times
The Washington Times A6
The Wall Street Journal
The Christian Science Monitor
New York Daily News
USA Today
The Chicago Tribune

Date 7 July 1989

Hypersonic plane plan survives

REUTERS NEWS AGENCY

Plans for a successor to the space shuttle — a hypersonic plane able to carry its passengers into space at speeds 25 times faster than sound — have survived a challenge from defense officials worried about its high cost.

But the "Aerospace" or "X-30" plane, trumpeted by former President Reagan as the last word in jet travel for the 21st century, is headed for sharply reduced funding.

Aerospace planners dream of a plane that can take off from a civilian airport, zoom into space at 17,000 miles an hour and cruise around in orbit before touching back down to earth.

The National Aero-Space Program (NASP) projects putting such a craft into space by 1994 or 1995.

"This is the logical successor to the space shuttle in the next century. The potential for people to use space launches for civil and military purposes is tremendous, but first you've got to bring the costs down. X-30 would do that," said NASP official Maj. Jess Sponable.

The National Space Council, headed by Vice President Dan Quayle, a strong Aerospace supporter, decided Friday to ask President Bush to carry on with the project but at a far lower funding level than its supporters had hoped, according to Rep. Dave McCurdy, Oklahoma Democrat.

Mr. McCurdy said the council had decided to seek only $254 million for the plane for the current fiscal year, down from the $412 million level backed by the House Armed Services Committee, of which Mr. McCurdy is a member.

Funding at this level "is better than nothing but may cost America its frontrunner status in the international hypersonic flight technology race," Mr. McCurdy said in a statement.

The shortfall means the aircraft will likely end up a far cry from its halcyon days in the early 1980s, when Mr. Reagan dubbed it the "Orient Express" and boasted it would fly passengers from New York to Tokyo in an hour.

To meet the administration's budget goal, the project probably will now be trimmed back by cutting the plane's capabilities and slowing development, officials said.

At the center of the administration debate was whether the plane would have primarily military or civilian uses.

Proponents of military applications argued the plane could one day serve as a fighter or a spy plane, or could transport large military payloads.

But Defense Secretary Richard Cheney nearly crippled Aerospace earlier this year by proposing to cut its Defense Department funding and to turn the project over to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which handles civilian space projects.

"At NASA it would basically founder for lack of attention. It could kill it," said a U.S. official.

But congressional supporters of the plane stepped in and now appear to have revived the project by enlisting Mr. Quayle's support.

U.S. officials say about 5,000 people are working on the plane, but at a very high cost to taxpayers.

The price-tag for the first prototype is estimated at between $3 billion and $7 billion.

Supporters pushing civilian applications for the plane tout it as the successor to the space shuttle and the cutting edge of commercial air service in the 21st century.

But recent studies by the National Research Council and the Rand Corporation portray Aerospace as something of a flying white elephant.

The report by the National Research Council, an arm of the National Academy of Sciences, casts doubt on the technical feasibility or desirability of flying passengers into space orbit and back.

One of the key problems with Aerospace is its very might.

At such high speeds, the plane could wreck eardrums for miles around if it flew over land at normal altitudes. Slowing it down before landing would defeat its purpose.

"It's very high-risk, very expensive and nobody knows what it's good for," said John Pike, a space researcher with the Federation of American Scientists.

Global competition is another impetus, with West Germany and Japan also battling for the lead in hypersonic flight.

But the Central Intelligence Agency says would-be competitors are 10 to 15 years behind the United States.

At the Paris Air Show in June, some of the major players, including the United States and Soviet Union, talked about multinational efforts to help spread the costs of the plane.

B-500 H

DCI EXEC REG

Page 6

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

Subject: Request for Additional Information on the Natinal Aerospace Plane

From: [redacted] STAT
EA/DDS&T
6E60 Hqs [redacted] STAT

DDS&T-502-89
23 May 1989

To: (Officer designation)	* Date * rec'd	fwd'd	init	Comments:
1. Executive Registry 7E12 Hqs Bldg				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				

B-500

DCI EXEC REG

SECRET

25X1

Next 3 Page(s) In Document Denied

RETARIAT

ROUTING SLIP

TO:

		ACTION	INFO	DATE	INITIAL
1	DCI		X		
2	DDCI		X		
3	EXDIR				
4	D/ICS		X		
5	DDI		X		
6	DDA				
7	DDO				
8	DDS&T		X		
9	Chm/NIC				
10	GC				
11	IG				
12	Compt		X		
13	D/OCA		X		
14	D/PAO				
15	D/PERS				
16	D/Ex Staff				
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
	SUSPENSE _____ Date				

Remarks

ER 89-1955

Executive Secretary

9 May 89

Date

3637 (10-81)

ER 89-1955

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

Washington, DC 20515

ATTACHMENT

May 2, 1989

The Honorable Dan Quayle
Vice President
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. Vice President,

In his testimony before the House Armed Services Committee April 25, Defense Secretary Cheney revealed his plan to place the National Aerospace Plane (NASP) and $100 million in DoD funds under the exclusive jurisdiction of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. NASA officials have made it clear that withdrawal of DoD support for NASP would ultimately kill the program.

Secretary Cheney also revealed that the National Space Council, which you chair, will review future funding and administrative questions that currently surround the NASP. Knowing of your keen interest in U.S. space technology, we are joining in this expression of our active support for continued joint agency funding of NASP as an experimental research vehicle with equal value as a civilian or military system. In concluding that NASP is strictly a civilian aviation program, the Department of Defense has failed to recognize that the aero-space plane is a technology that promises national security means well into the 21st century.

The National Aerospace Plane is a natural product of our intense need to return to the forefront of space technology. It is an idea almost universally viewed with enthusiasm by the civil, military and industrial world. The U.S. NASP research and development program has already drawn an incredible investment of over $700 million from a consortium of private industries. It is the envy of all other industrial nations. The Japanese have identified aero-space plane research as the means to becoming "the world's premier manufacturer of composite materials and advanced propulsion systems".

The debate over Department of Defense participation in NASP research and development is mindful of the post-World War II era when some very hard lessons were well understood by General Marshall, Secretary Forrestal, and Air Force Chiefs Vandenberg and White. The Congress shared their understanding of those hard lessons: that the strength of the nation rested in the muscle of

its weapons technology and the foresight of its leaders. Out of that experience came an unparalleled Air Force of B-52s and Mach 2 fighters and visions of a growing technical base to sustain our strength.

However, Defense Secretary McNamara cancelled that emerging technology. He placed our research advances on hold. Pressed by budget constraints, he led decisions to refurbish old technologies rather than develop new ones. Thirty years later, we have the same Air Force of B-52s, Mach 2 fighters and 1950s technology.

Mr. Vice President, it is with utmost urgency that we express our support for a sustained government commitment to NASP. As Vice President, as Chairman of the National Space Council and as one who advocates U.S. competitiveness in the world, you have a key role in U.S. technological development. To cancel the National Aerospace Plane in 1990 is to ensure our technological mediocrity beyond.

Thank you for your valued leadership on this vital issue.

Sincerely,

Dave McCurdy, M.C.

Bob Livingston, M.C.

Robert A. Roe, M.C.

Robert Walker, M.C.

Beverly Byron, M.C.

Bill Young, M.C.

Ronnie Flippo, M.C.

Robert Davis, M.C.

Tim Valentine, M.C.

Duncan Hunter, M.C.

Dan Glickman, M.C.

Denny Smith, M.C.

George E. Brown, M.C.

Jack Buechner, M.C.

Elton Gallegly, M.C.

Tom Lewis, M.C.

James Inhofe, M.C.

Dana Rohrabacher, M.C.

Christopher Shays, M.C.

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2013/11/12 :
CIA-RDP91B01306R000300070008-4

ROUTING SLIP

TO:			ACTION	INFO	DATE	INITIAL
	1	DCI		X		
	2	DDCI		X		
	3	EXDIR				
	4	D/ICS		X		
	5	DDI		X		
	6	DDA				
	7	DDO				
	8	DDS&T		X		
	9	Chm/NIC				
	10	GC				
	11	IG				
	12	Compt		X		
	13	D/OCA		X		
	14	D/PAO				
	15	D/PERS				
	16	D/Ex Staff				
	17					
	18					
	19					
	20					
	21					
	22					
		SUSPENSE _____ Date				

Remarks

ER 89-1955

Executive Secretary

9 May 89
Date

3637 (10-81)

Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release
2013/11/12 : CIA-RDP91B01306R000300070008-4

EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT

ROUTING SLIP

TO:		ACTION	INFO	DATE	INITIAL
1	DCI		X		
2	DDCI		X	9 May	RB
3	EXDIR				
4	D/ICS		X		
5	DDI		X		
6	DDA				
7	DDO				
8	DDS&T		X		
9	Chm/NIC				
10	GC				
11	IG				
12	Compt		X		
13	D/OCA		X		
14	D/PAO				
15	D/PERS				
16	D/Ex Staff				
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
	SUSPENSE _____ Date				

Remarks

ER 89-1955

Executive Secretary

9 May 89

Date

3637 (10-81)

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

Washington, DC 20515

May 2, 1989

The Honorable Dan Quayle
Vice President
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. Vice President,

In his testimony before the House Armed Services Committee April 25, Defense Secretary Cheney revealed his plan to place the National Aerospace Plane (NASP) and $100 million in DoD funds under the exclusive jurisdiction of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. NASA officials have made it clear that withdrawal of DoD support for NASP would ultimately kill the program.

Secretary Cheney also revealed that the National Space Council, which you chair, will review future funding and administrative questions that currently surround the NASP. Knowing of your keen interest in U.S. space technology, we are joining in this expression of our active support for continued joint agency funding of NASP as an experimental research vehicle with equal value as a civilian or military system. In concluding that NASP is strictly a civilian aviation program, the Department of Defense has failed to recognize that the aero-space plane is a technology that promises national security means well into the 21st century.

The National Aerospace Plane is a natural product of our intense need to return to the forefront of space technology. It is an idea almost universally viewed with enthusiasm by the civil, military and industrial world. The U.S. NASP research and development program has already drawn an incredible investment of over $700 million from a consortium of private industries. It is the envy of all other industrial nations. The Japanese have identified aero-space plane research as the means to becoming "the world's premier manufacturer of composite materials and advanced propulsion systems".

The debate over Department of Defense participation in NASP research and development is mindful of the post-World War II era when some very hard lessons were well understood by General Marshall, Secretary Forrestal, and Air Force Chiefs Vandenberg and White. The Congress shared their understanding of those hard lessons: that the strength of the nation rested in the muscle of

its weapons technology and the foresight of its leaders. Out of that experience came an unparalleled Air Force of B-52s and Mach 2 fighters and visions of a growing technical base to sustain our strength.

However, Defense Secretary McNamara cancelled that emerging technology. He placed our research advances on hold. Pressed by budget constraints, he led decisions to refurbish old technologies rather than develop new ones. Thirty years later, we have the same Air Force of B-52s, Mach 2 fighters and 1950s technology.

Mr. Vice President, it is with utmost urgency that we express our support for a sustained government commitment to NASP. As Vice President, as Chairman of the National Space Council and as one who advocates U.S. competitiveness in the world, you have a key role in U.S. technological development. To cancel the National Aerospace Plane in 1990 is to ensure our technological mediocrity beyond.

Thank you for your valued leadership on this vital issue.

Sincerely,

Dave McCurdy, M.C.

Bob Livingston, M.C.

Robert A. Roe, M.C.

Robert Walker, M.C.

Beverly Byron, M.C.

Bill Young, M.C.

Ronnie Flippo, M.C.

Robert Davis, M.C.

Tim Valentine, M.C.

Duncan Hunter, M.C.

Dan Glickman, M.C.

Denny Smith, M.C.

George Brown, M.C.

Jack Buechner, M.C.

Elton Gallegly, M.C.

Tom Lewis, M.C.

James Inhofe, M.C.

Dana Rohrabacher, M.C.

Christopher Shays, M.C.

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

National Aerospace Plane (NASP) Policy Review

FROM:	EXTENSION	NO.
Lieutenant General Edward J. Heinz, USAF Director, Intelligence Community Staff		ICS 4244-89
		DATE 2 May 1989

STAT

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)	DATE RECEIVED	DATE FORWARDED	OFFICER'S INITIALS	COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)
1. Larry Sandall O-DCI Room 7E12 Original Headquarters				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				

B-500.1R

DCI EXEC REG

FORM 1-79 **610** USE PREVIOUS EDITIONS

Director
Intelligence Community Staff
Washington, D.C. 20505

ICS 4244-89

2 May 1989

MEMORANDUM FOR: Mr. Mark H. Albrecht
Executive Secretary-Designate
National Space Council

SUBJECT: National Aerospace Plane (NASP) Policy Review

The principal Intelligence Community representative to the National Aerospace Plane Ad Hoc Working Group being established by the National Space Council is [redacted] In his capacity as a senior policy officer in the Planning and Policy Office of the Intelligence Community Staff, [redacted] will coordinate Intelligence Community support to the development of policy options and associated implementing actions for Council consideration. He can be reached at [redacted]

STAT
STAT
STAT
STAT
STAT

[redacted]

Edward J. Heinz
Lieutenant General, USAF

All Portions of this
Memorandum are Unclassified

SUBJECT: National Aerospace Plane (NASP) Policy Review

DISTRIBUTION: (ICS 4244-89)

Copy 1 - Executive Secretary--Designate
2 - O-DCI (Larry Sandall)
3 - D/ICS
4 - D/PPO--DD/PPO
5 - PPO (Subject)
6 - PPO Chrono
7 - ICS Registry

DCI/ICS/PPO [redacted] (1 May 1989) STAT

EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT

ROUTING SLIP

TO:			ACTION	INFO	DATE	INITIAL
	1	DCI		X		
	2	DDCI		X		
	3	EXDIR				
	4	D/ICS	X			
	5	DDI		X		
	6	DDA				
	7	DDO				
	8	DDS&T		X		
	9	Chm/NIC				
	10	GC				
	11	IG				
	12	Compt				
	13	D/OCA				
	14	D/PAO				
	15	D/PERS				
	16	D/Ex Staff				
	17	C/CRES/DI		X		
	18					
	19					
	20					
	21					
	22					
		SUSPENSE _____ Date				

Remarks

B-5001R

To # 4: Direct contact with the Space Council Staff, info to ES, please.

ACS FILE W/ER FILE Copy

DCI EXEC REG

ER 1785/89

Executive Secretary

1 May 89
Date

3637 (10-81)

EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT

ROUTING SLIP

TO:		ACTION	INFO	DATE	INITIAL
1	DCI		X		
2	DDCI		X		
3	EXDIR				
4	D/ICS	X			
5	DDI		X		
6	DDA				
7	DDO				
8	DDS&T		X		
9	Chm/NIC				
10	GC				
11	IG				
12	Compt				
13	D/OCA				
14	D/PAO				
15	D/PERS				
16	D/Ex Staff				
17	C/CRES/DI		X		
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
	SUSPENSE		Date		

B500.1P

Remarks

To # 4: Direct contact with the Space Council Staff, info to ES, please.

DCI EXEC REG

ES FILE W/ER FILE COPY

Executive Secretary

1 May 89
Date

ER 1785-89

3637 (10-81)

EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT

ROUTING SLIP

TO:

		ACTION	INFO	DATE	INITIAL
1	DCI		X		
2	DDCI		X		
3	EXDIR				
4	D/ICS	X			
5	DDI		X		
6	DDA				
7	DDO				
8	DDS&T		X		
9	Chm/NIC				
10	GC				
11	IG				
12	Compt				
13	D/OCA				
14	D/PAO				
15	D/PERS				
16	D/Ex Staff				
17	C/CRES/DI		X		
18					
19					
20					
21					
22	ER				
	SUSPENSE				

Date

Remarks

To # 4: Direct contact with the Space Council Staff, info to ES, please.

STAT

3637 (10-81)

ER 89-1785

NATIONAL SPACE COUNCIL

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20500

April 28, 1989

MEMORANDUM FOR

MS. EMILY L. WALKER
Executive Secretary
Department of Treasury

MR. FRANK HODSOLL
Associate Director
Office of Management and Budget

MR. J. STAPLETON ROY
Executive Secretary
Department of State

MR. G. PHILIP HUGHES
Executive Secretary
National Security Council

COL. GEORGE P. COLE JR.
Executive Secretary
Department of Defense

DR. WILLIAM GRAHAM
Director
Office of Science and Technology Policy

MR. CRAIG R. HELSING
Chief of Staff
Department of Commerce

MR. H. LAWRENCE SANDALL
Executive Secretary
Central Intelligence Agency

MS. RUTH KNOUSE
Director, Executive Secretariat
Department of Transportation

CAPT ANTHONY MANESS
Executive Assistant to the Chairman
Joint Chiefs of Staff

SUBJECT: National Aero-Space Plane Policy Review

The National Space Council will conduct a review of national policy with regard to the National Aero-Space Plane. This review will result in recommendations to the President as to an appropriate policy and measures necessary to implement that policy.

An Ad Hoc Working Group is being established to develop policy options and associated implementing actions for Council consideration. Please identify your agency representative to the Working Group by telephoning the Council staff at 395-6175 not later than May 2, 1989. The first Working Group meeting is tentatively scheduled for May 3, 1989.

For James P. Beale

MARK J. ALBRECHT
Executive Secretary Designate

B 500.1R

DCI EXEC REG

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION
Washington, D.C. 20503

TO: Mr. H. Lawrence Sandall X20816

LOCATION: CIA

FAX NUMBER: STAT

FROM: Col. Jim Beale

ROOM NUMBER: 423

PHONE EXT: 6175

PLEASE DELIVER AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.